



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## RECENT HEBRAICA AND JUDAICA.

*Pirḳê de-Rabbi Eliezer* (the Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer the Great).

According to the text of the manuscript belonging to Abraham Epstein of Vienna. Translated and annotated. With introduction and indices. By GERALD FRIEDLANDER. London: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co., 1916. pp. lx + 490.

THE appearance of the Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer in translation is a matter for congratulation, as only a very small number of rabbinic books has hitherto been translated into English. It is true that there are more important books which may claim preference, but no one will quarrel with the Rev. Gerald Friedlander for having selected this book, in which, owing to its many-sidedness, he takes special interest. In mode of treatment and form of presentation this book stands between the early Midrashim and the later pseudepigraphic writings like the *Sefer ha-Yashar*. There is a certain uniformity of structure and purpose in this book, and this in itself may furnish us a clue as to the approximate period of its compilation. As is the case with practically all Midrashim, the greater part of the material used by the compiler dates from amoraic times, but the compilation was no doubt made much later. The continuity of narrative maintained in a great number of the chapters would lead one to place this book in the same category as the *Midrash Petirat Mosheh*, *Midrash Yonah*, and similar Midrashim. To this group belongs, to my mind, the twenty-sixth section of the *Pesikta Rabbati* (Friedmann's edition, pp. 128 b-132 a), which is out of harmony with the rest of the book. The very fact that this section does not begin with a biblical verse, as is the case with all other sections, is sufficient to excite suspicion. Then the continuity of narrative, where biblical verses are often not quoted but skilfully interwoven with

the author's own words, would point to the conjecture that this section formed a book by itself which may have been called *Midrash Yirmeyahu*. It is noteworthy that this section is missing in a manuscript in the possession of Dr. A. Cohen, of London, who kindly put it at my disposal for the preparation of an edition of the *Pesikta Rabbati* in the 'Jewish Classics Series'; although it must be owned that other apparently authentic sections are not included in that manuscript, to which I hope to devote a special article. On the other hand, the authors or compilers of this group of books still retain the midrashic mode of treatment, and have not reached that stage of the *Sefer ha-Yashar* where the style of the narrative parts of the Bible is imitated and evenly maintained throughout the book. These considerations appear to me more cogent for determining the approximate age of these books than certain allusions to historical events. These allusions are mostly incidental, and may after all be later interpolations. Mr. Friedlander rightly adopts the current view held by the majority of Jewish scholars that the *Chapters* were compiled during the first quarter of the ninth century. And this is the period to which the stylistic evidence points.

As to the origin of this book, Müller suggested that the compiler had lived in Palestine. He was led to this view by the religious customs peculiar to this book. This theory finds striking confirmation in the following passage occurring in the book in connexion with the principle of intercalation: 'When Jacob went out of the Holy Land, he attempted to intercalate the year outside the Holy Land. The Holy One, blessed be He, said to him: "Jacob, thou hast no authority to intercalate the year outside the land of Israel"' (p. 54; see also p. 56). It seems to me that such a statement could only have been made by a Palestinian writer, as may be seen from the controversy which took place a century later between the Gaon Saadya in Babylon and Ben Meir in Palestine.

Traditionally this book is ascribed to R. Eliezer the Great, one of the most famous Tannaim. How the tradition arose is one of the numerous literary problems connected with this work.

Did the author or compiler himself hide his identity behind the name of this great personality, or was the authorship of this book ascribed to R. Eliezer by a later generation? At the present stage of our knowledge we have no means of answering this question. The first two chapters pretend to give a biographical sketch of R. Eliezer, and this would apparently furnish the reason why his name was connected with this work. But it is to be observed that in some manuscripts these introductory chapters are missing, and one would be justified in suspecting that these chapters were added after the entire work had been ascribed to R. Eliezer. Mr. Friedlander touches very lightly upon this problem, and, after discussing the various possibilities, he seems to incline to the view that the author deliberately selected the name of this famous Tanna in order to avoid the danger of being placed under the ban for the daring displayed in his book.

A careful analysis of these *Chapters* would prove that the author's plan was to give amplified accounts of the biblical narratives. It is difficult to assert whether this work has been preserved in its entirety or not, but in its extant form it contains fifty-four chapters, which are in some manuscripts counted as fifty-three, the last two chapters being taken as one. Of these chapters the first two, as has been stated above, are introductory and do not form part of the work proper. Chapters III–XI deal with the work of Creation; XII–XXII tell the stories of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel; XXIII and XXIV deal with Noah and the Flood; XXV refers to Sodom; XXVI–XXXIII set forth the account of Abraham and Isaac; XXXIV is a short treatise on the resurrection of the dead; XXXV–XXXIX deal with Jacob and Joseph; XL–XLIII tell of Moses, the revelation on mount Sinai, and the exodus (the chapters should undoubtedly be arranged chronologically); XLIV refers to Amalek; XLV–XLVII tell of the golden calf; XLVIII resumes the story of the exodus; XLIX and L treat of Mordecai and Haman; LI is eschatological; LII describes the wonders of old; LIII and LIV give a few incidents of Israel's wanderings in the wilderness. It is thus obvious that, with the exception of chapter XXXIV, chapters

III-L amplify the narratives of Genesis, Exodus, and the Book of Esther. If one or two chapters are rearranged, it will become apparent that the author followed the biblical order very closely. The remaining few chapters, which are of a miscellaneous character, may be later interpolations, or may have been inserted by the author himself for some reason or another. The author now and again gives a mystical aspect to the narratives, and tries to link them together under certain catchwords. Thus some of the narratives begin with the *descents* which God made. The author also incorporates into the narratives chapters which, from a modern point of view, would be regarded as irrelevant. In dealing with the creation of the planets the author takes the opportunity to give the principles of intercalation. Nevertheless the uniformity of his plan cannot be ignored. Mr. Friedlander is of opinion that this book is, in all probability, a composite work, consisting of three originally distinct sections. One part described the ten *descents* made by God, another gave a detailed account of rabbinic mysticism, and another was a Midrash on the Eighteen Benedictions. The untenability of this view may be proved by the circumstance that these component parts cannot be separated from one another without impairing the progress of the various narratives. While it is true, as has been pointed out above, that there are a few chapters which may easily be removed, it is just the chapters dealing with the *descents* and alluding to the Eighteen Benedictions which form the integral parts of the framework. The author no doubt tried to include everything in his work : mysticism, principles of intercalation, and moral lessons. In telling the story of Abraham's life it was quite natural to mention the benediction connected with his name : 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham' (p. 196). But all this in no way indicates that various books were combined into one. Rabbinic literature teems with examples where various subjects were incorporated into one book. Even codifiers did not think it necessary to keep always to the subject under discussion.

In his introduction Mr. Friedlander has collected a great deal of material, and almost all the important problems connected with

the book have been discussed, although his presentation lacks literary form. Some of the paragraphs really belong to the notes on the translation, while a good many of the notes should have been utilized in the introduction. The greater part of the introduction is devoted to the relation of Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer to the Talmud, Targum, Midrash, Zohar, and Liturgy, as well as to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. In this part especially Mr. Friedlander displays a remarkable mastery of the subject and a thorough acquaintance with all the branches of this vast literature. At the same time it must be owned that some of the parallel passages may be accidental, and do not prove the dependence of the author of the *Chapters* upon the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic works. On the whole, it seems to me that Mr. Friedlander overrates the influence of the Book of Jubilees on our author. The mode of thought, style, and phraseology of the *Chapters* are midrashic with a distinct tendency toward mysticism. It is quite conceivable that a man imbued with the midrashic spirit could have written these *Chapters* without having seen any part of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature. There is nothing to gain by comparing such expressions as 'the middle of the earth' (p. xxx), 'since the creation of the world' (p. xxxii), 'remember you for good' (p. xxxiii), which happen to occur in the Book of Enoch and in the Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer. Even the more striking resemblances do not warrant the conclusions drawn by Mr. Friedlander, as the doctrines of the Book of Jubilees and similar works may have been known by the author of the *Chapters* from other sources.

The copious notes with which the translation is furnished are of a high scholarly standard. They deal mainly with parallel passages and expressions occurring in rabbinic literature and in apocryphal and pseudepigraphic works. They also elucidate difficult passages in the Hebrew text, and draw attention to the variants in the printed editions as well as in the manuscripts which Mr. Friedlander collated. The foundation is thus laid for a critical edition of the original. Some of the notes, however, are irrelevant and unnecessary. This, however, is an error in

the right direction, and students will certainly be grateful to Mr. Friedlander for his assiduity and conscientious work.

As stated on the title-page, the translation of the *Chapters* is based on the text of the manuscript in the possession of Abraham Epstein, of Vienna. When various manuscripts of a text are extant, critical editors usually adopt one of the two methods: they either base their edition upon one manuscript and give the variants in the notes, or publish an eclectic text, selecting the best readings from all sources. The latter method is naturally more difficult, as the editor must be very cautious not to adopt an inferior reading; but, if successfully carried out, it offers many advantages to the reader. One would, however, question the advisability of basing a translation upon a single manuscript and giving obviously corrupt readings. This is especially unwise in the case of a book like the *Chapters*, which has been repeatedly printed and has enjoyed great popularity. The Epstein MS. has undoubtedly preserved some excellent readings. A very interesting instance may be cited. In ch. xxxvi the printed editions read: 'R. Akiba says: "Anyone who enters a city and meets maidens coming forth, his way will be prosperous . . . And again whence dost thou learn this? From Moses our teacher. Before entering the city he met maidens coming forth, as it is said: Now the priest of Midian had seven daughters, and they came . . . And He prospered his way, and he advanced to kingship."' The difficulty in this passage is due to the circumstance that the earlier sources do not know of the kingship of Moses. Reference is usually made to Zebāḥim 102a. But in that passage the word *king* is used in a loose sense, and simply means leader (of Israel). By no stretch of imagination can one find in the words יבמה מלך an allusion to the elaborate account given in the *Sefer ha-Yashar* of the kingship of Moses, who miraculously defeated the enemy and was anointed king of Cush instead of Ẓiḡanus. But the Epstein MS. proves that in the printed editions a paragraph fell out through homoioteleuton. According to that MS. we have to insert, after 'and he was prosperous', the following paragraph: 'and he redeemed Israel. And again

whence dost thou know this? From Saul. Before he entered the city he met maidens coming forth, as it is said: As they went up the ascent to the city, they found young maidens going out. And He prospered his way.' Thus the words 'and he advanced to kingship' refer to Saul, not to Moses. Is it possible that an error of this nature gave rise to the legendary narrative of the *Sefer ha-Yashar*? The origin of legends is veiled in obscurity. The poetic imagination weaves fanciful tales about famous heroes. But it is not unlikely that a slight misunderstanding of an oral or written narrative may set the fancy working. The Koran abounds in examples to illustrate this view.

On the other hand, in a number of cases the Epstein MS. is decidedly corrupt. P. 93: 'He said to her: "All that I have shall be in thy hands, except this house, which is full of scorpions."' The word *house*, repeated a few times on this page, makes no sense at all. The printed editions have 'cask', which is the only possible reading. It is quite obvious that a copyist mistook a ה for a ח, and read הבית instead of חבית. Such a mistake is perfectly natural, but why should we perpetuate it in a translation? As Mr. Friedlander does not describe the Epstein MS., it is hard to say whether ה and ח are clearly differentiated there. P. 180: 'The Holy One, blessed be He, answered him: "Abraham, by the merit of the righteous (one) will I forgive Sodom. If I find in Sodom fifty righteous, then will I forgive it all its sins."' The last two sentences manifestly contradict each other: at first it is said that one righteous man is sufficient to secure pardon for Sodom, and then fifty righteous ones are required. The printed editions have: 'By the merit of fifty righteous men will I forgive Sodom, as it is said . . .' P. 227: 'Isaac said to his father Abraham: "O my father, bind for me my two hands and my two feet, so that I should not curse thee."' It is hard to understand how the binding of his hands and feet would prevent him from cursing. The printed editions have: 'to avoid an accident (פשיעותה) is correct and not פשיטותה, as Mr. Friedlander emends it), which would cause me to break the commandment "Honour thy father."' Mr. Friedlander does

not give the Hebrew of this sentence according to the Epstein MS. ; but if it is אקלל, it may be a mistake for אהלל, the remaining words having fallen out. It is also likely that it was corrupted from אקלקל (I shall be disqualified). P. 280 : 'Concerning this Solomon said : "And break in pieces their pillars."' As this verse occurs in Exodus 23. 24, it is obvious that the printed editions have preserved the correct reading : 'Concerning this Moses said . . .' P. 320 : 'Hence thou mayest learn that the words of the Torah are like coals of fire. Why was it "at His right hand"? Whence do we know (that it was given to them) with expression of love? Because it is said : "The Lord hath sworn by His right hand, and by the arm of His strength."' The quotation does not harmonize with the preceding sentence. The printed editions read correctly : 'Hence thou mayest learn that the words of the Torah are like coals of fire. He gave it to them with an expression of love, as it is said : "His left hand is under my head (and His *right hand* doth embrace me)"; and with an expression of oath, as it is said : "The Lord hath sworn by His *right hand*, and by the arm of His strength."'

Mr. Friedlander is not quite consistent in adhering to his manuscript, as he deviates from it in some instances. Thus on p. 319 he correctly translates : 'Thence He sent messengers to all the nations of the world.' But his manuscript has 'And Moses' instead of 'Thence'—that is, משה for משם. But why was it not possible to eliminate all the scribal errors?

From the philological point of view the translation of the Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer does not offer any serious difficulties. The author's style is fluent and easy, without any mixture of Aramaic, which is frequently found in the earlier Midrashim. Still there are pitfalls, especially in the biblical quotations, which at first sight would appear the easiest task for the translator. It must be borne in mind that a midrashic interpretation sometimes involves a far-fetched and impossible way of construing a biblical verse. One would be misinterpreting the Midrash were one to translate these quotations in accordance with modern philology. Mr. Friedlander is evidently conscious of this fact, though he did

not always successfully avoid these pitfalls. There are other inaccuracies due to his having faultily construed some sentences. In the following remarks attention will be called to some of these errors, which in no way detract from the general merits of the work.

P. 7. 'He said to them: (R. Jochanan) should not have spoken in that manner, but (in this wise), "Happy am I because he has come forth from my loins."' As Hyrkanos was R. Eliezer's father, the last sentence could not be the direct speech of R. Johanan. Translate: 'but I am the happy one because...'

P. 9. In consequence of a wrong division of sentences, Mr. Friedlander was obliged to supply an object and a complement, and he missed the sense of the original: 'Not even the ministering angels are able to narrate (the Divine praise). But to investigate a part of His mighty deeds with reference to what He has done, and what He will do in the future (is permissible), so that His name should be exalted among His creatures.' What the Hebrew original says is: 'Even the ministering angels are only able to declare a part of His mighty deeds. Nevertheless we should investigate what He has done and what He will do, so that . . .' It is unlikely that the Epstein MS. differs from the printed texts, as the fact is not stated in the notes.

P. 125. According to the midrashic interpretation, it would be more suitable to render Ps. 49. 13: 'Adam abideth not in glory over night,' instead of 'Man in glory tarrieth not over night.' In the notes Mr. Friedlander rightly observes: 'The Hebrew word is "Adam."' But the force of the Midrash should have been brought out in the translation.

P. 126. The reason why Psalm 92 was ascribed to Moses is given in *Pesiḳta Rabbati* (Friedmann's edition, p. 187a), from which passage it is apparent that the heading **מוֹדֵר שִׁיר לַיּוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת** was taken as the acrostic **לְמֹשֶׁה**.

P. 131. 'And Israel who (will be) in the land (of Palestine) (will experience) great trouble, but in their troubles they (will be) like a green olive, as it is said, "I am anointed with fresh oil."' The biblical quotation does not bear out the statement of the

Midrash. Mr. Friedlander remarks in his notes that the Midrash interprets 'I am anointed' as though it were connected with the root *balah*, 'to afflict.' Cp. 1 Chron. 17. 9. Accordingly, the verse should be rendered: 'when I am in distress, I am like fresh oil.' It is to be observed that while in 1 Chron. 17. 9 לְבַלְתִּי stands for לְעָנֹתִי, as in 2 Sam. 7. 10, it is not unlikely that the author of the *Chapters* knew the Arabic word *balā* a calamity. See below remark on p. 222.

P. 143. 'Driving out, (i.e.) and he went forth outside the garden of Eden.' This is rather clumsy. The original has: 'Having been driven out (גִּירָשׁ), he went forth . . .'

P. 152. According to the midrashic interpretation, Ps. 89. 3 should be rendered: 'For I have said: "The world was built up by a shameful thing,"' the reference being to Lev. 20. 17. The Midrash hastens to explain: 'By a shameful thing was the world built up before the Torah had been given.' Mr. Friedlander grasped the purport of the Midrash, as is shown by the notes, and yet he has: 'The world shall be built up by love.' On the same page he omitted the words 'He replied' before 'From these words know . . .'. This statement is obviously the answer of R. Miasha, and cannot be the continuation of R. Simeon's question. The printed editions have אֵל, and we are not informed that these words are missing in the Epstein MS.

P. 222. "'Swords" signify only wars.' It seems very likely that the author had the Arabic *ḥarb* in mind. Although there is no conclusive evidence that the author of the *Chapters* was influenced by Arabic literature, he may have had some slight acquaintance with that language. See above remark on p. 131.

P. 224. 'Is it concerning the son lacking circumcision, or the son born for circumcision?' This is unintelligible. The Hebrew means: 'Dost Thou allude to the son born before the law of circumcision had been given or to the son born after that law had been given?' The words עֶרְלָה and מִלָּה refer to Abraham himself and not to Ishmael and Isaac.

P. 232. The Midrash demands that Gen. 6. 3 should be rendered: 'My spirit shall not strive with man for ever on

account of *Beshaggam* (the numerical value of **בשגם** is equal to that of **מישה**). But Mr. Friedlander renders it: 'My spirit shall not abide in man for ever in their going astray,' and the entire passage is thereby made obscure.

P. 233. The etymology of the name Josiah according to the Midrash is **יאי שי הוא** which means: 'he is fit for an offering or gift.' Mr. Friedlander confused **שֵׁי** with **שִׁי**, and rendered this phrase: 'he is worthy like a lamb.'

P. 264. The midrashic point is missed in the rendering of 1 Chron. 17. 21: '*a nation that is alone* on the earth.' It should be: 'one nation on the earth.'

P. 268 (and elsewhere). The expression **מנין תרע שהוא בן** should best be rendered: 'Whence dost thou know that it is so?' Mr. Friedlander erroneously divides this phrase into question and answer: 'Whence dost thou know this? Know that it is so.'

P. 281. 'Who stood by the way like a bear bereaved by man.' This reading of the Epstein MS. is superior to that of the printed editions which have: 'Who stood by the way like a bear and came . . .' There can be no doubt that a copyist had abbreviated **בארם** into **בא** which was afterwards mistaken for a complete word. See also p. 346, note 1.

P. 311. Isa. 26. 10 is interpreted by the Midrash: 'Let favour be shown to the wicked, because he did not learn righteousness.' Mr. Friedlander follows the Anglican version: 'yet will he not learn righteousness,' which does not suit the context.

P. 340. 'The treasury of the living' is inappropriate; read: 'the treasury of life.'

P. 246. 'Amalek was smiting and slaying.' In note 11 we are told that the Epstein MS. has **והולך**. This should be rendered: 'he kept on smiting.' Is it possible that the author had the Arabic meaning of **مَلَكَ** (*perished*) in mind?

P. 359. 'It is possible that even thou (Moses) shouldst return.' This is out of harmony with what follows. Moreover **יכול** in such cases introduces a question. Translate: 'Is one to

assume that even thou shouldst return?' The following sentence negatives this assumption.

P. 377. The name 'Ganon,' one of Ephraim's grandchildren, is undoubtedly borrowed from Isa. xxxi. 5. The printed texts have 'Yignon,' an imperfect formation from the same root. Mr. Friedlander transliterates the former as 'Ganoon' and the latter as 'Jagnoon.' These are impossible forms which obscure the etymology of the names.

P. 422. 'From the day when the heavens and the earth were created no man was ill, (who) sneezed and lived, but in every place where he happened to be, whether on the way or in the market, and (when he) sneezed, his soul went out through his nostrils.' This is an unintelligible passage. The Epstein MS. has a different reading, but it seems that Mr. Friedlander misconstrued it. In note 6 he tells us that the first editions, which differ from the MS., read: 'no man was ill unless he happened to be on the way or in the market-place.' This is again a mistranslation. What the printed texts really have is: 'no man had ever been ill, but wherever he happened to be, on the way or in the market-place, he would sneeze, and his soul would go out through his nostrils.' This is in accordance with *Baba me-ši'a* 87 a.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Friedlander will soon issue a critical edition of the Hebrew text of the *Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer*, and thus enable his fellow-workers to examine the variants of the manuscripts which he consulted for his translation.

*Monumenta Talmudica.* Fünfter Band: Geschichte, I. Teil: Griechen und Römer. Bearbeitet von SAMUEL KRAUSS. Wien und Leipzig: ORION-VERLAG, 1914, pp. xi + 194.

For more than five centuries the Jews were in close contact with the Romans, and their influence over one another must have been of considerable importance. It is true that, owing to the diametrically opposed views of life held by these two nations, no

mutual understanding between them was possible. The Roman despised the Jew for his idealism, and the Jew looked upon the Roman as upon a vile oppressor whose sole aim was to satisfy his lusts and worldly desires. In Roman literature the Jew is ridiculed, and his most sacred religious rites are branded as abominable superstitions. But it is good 'to see ourselves as others see us,' and Jewish historians are utilizing Théodore Reinach's collection of fragments relating to Jews which occur in Greek and Latin books (*Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaïsme*). Similarly it is of service to Greek and Roman history to collect the passages occurring in rabbinic literature in which reference is made, directly or indirectly, to the Greeks and Romans. The historian of the classical world would thus get the two extreme views: the boastfulness of the oppressor and the contempt of the oppressed. It is quite possible that in the cryptic allusions of the Rabbis material would be discovered which is otherwise unknown. There may be some incidental references to Greek and Roman customs and manners which are not found in the classical sources. Unpleasant traits of Roman life would especially be brought out more clearly in Jewish literature. The trustworthiness of these sources cannot be assailed, as an intimate acquaintance with the internal life of the Romans is manifest in the Talmud as well as in almost all the various Midrashim, although due allowance must be made for the bias of a foreign race, and not every detail should be accepted.

The contact of Greek and Jewish civilizations took place during the last centuries of the biblical period, when the literary productivity of the Jews was in abeyance. There are accordingly very few indisputable references to the Greeks in the Bible, and even Cheyne in his *Job and Solomon* could only point to the influence of Greek thought in one or two books. In rabbinic literature, which arose centuries later, there can only be faint echoes of Greek life. These allusions are mostly based on earlier sources which were not infrequently misunderstood, and are of no historical importance unless we find independent corroboration. But quite different is the case with Roman history. Here rabbinic

literature furnishes contemporary evidence, offering a new point of view which cannot be ignored. The Midrashim and the aggadic portions of the Talmud abound in anecdotes about Roman life. A good many of the passages tell us of the persecutions the Jews suffered at the hand of the Roman emperors, and Rome is designated as מלכות הרשעה (the wicked government) without any further definition. Another favourite name for Rome is *Edom*, Israel's enemy in biblical times. The names of Hadrian, Trajan, and Tyrannus Rufus are usually accompanied by curses. Even in cases where an emperor is mentioned anonymously, it is sometimes possible to identify the one the rabbis had in mind.

The value of these passages for historical investigations had long been recognized. As early as 1852, Michael Sachs made ample use of this material, and in 1903 J. Ziegler collected and explained the parables about emperors occurring in the various Midrashim (*Die Königsgleichnisse des Midrasch beleuchtet durch die römische Kaiserzeit*). These books, however, are devoted to single phases of Roman life. Dr. Krauss' work is more ambitious and comprehensive, for it includes all phases of Greek and Roman history as illustrated in rabbinic literature. His aim is not to show the relation of the Romans to the Jews, although incidentally this, too, becomes apparent, but to present all the available material appertaining to the classical world. Dr. Krauss is one of the foremost Jewish scholars of our age, and has for many years devoted himself to the systematic study of the Talmud and Midrashim, especially in their relation to the classical literatures. His books on philology, archaeology, and history are monuments of erudition and sound scholarship. He is thus, perhaps more than any other living scholar, qualified to collect all the rabbinic texts and classify them according to their subjects. This is by no means an easy task. There are numerous passages whose real purport would escape the average reader, and it is only a master of classics and rabbinics who can discover historical allusions in them. And after the material has been collected, the systematic classification requires sound judgement. Apart from his scholarly reputation, Dr. Krauss inspires confidence by his mode of treat-

ment. He admits that at present it is neither possible nor desirable to exhaust all the rabbinic texts referring to the Greeks and Romans. His work is by no means final, and a great deal remains to be discovered and explained. At the same time there can be no doubt that the texts thus selected present as complete a picture as can be possibly obtained.

Dr. Krauss classified his texts into nine groups: A. Zur Geographie. B. Die vier Weltreiche. C. Die Griechen. D. Rom und die Völker. E. Kaiser und Feldherren. F. Kaiserverehrung. G. Kaiserrecht. H. Verwaltung. I. Verfall. The passages in each group are divided into suitable sections, and each paragraph has a heading of its own. The reader is thus enabled to see at a glance the purport and value of each paragraph. Not the least meritorious feature of this compilation is the skilful method of excerpting the passages. Some of the historical allusions are interwoven with entirely different subjects, and the difficulty of extricating them from their context must not be underrated. There is always the danger of citing more than necessary and thereby making the point at issue too insignificant to be noticed, or of giving unintelligible fragments. In the present volume only the essential parts have been cited, and yet each paragraph is complete in itself.

According to Dr. Krauss' statement (p. vii), only three of the groups (Zur Geographie, Die Griechen, Kaiser und Feldherren) are exhaustive, while no attempt was made to give anything like a complete collection of passages in the other groups. This is due to the fact that many of the references are too indefinite to be classified, while there are others whose historical value is more than doubtful. As to the judiciousness of the selections, we are obliged to rely on the authority of Dr. Krauss, for without a complete collection at hand one is unable to say whether the most appropriate texts have been included. Still there are passages which, to my mind, should have been incorporated in this volume. A conspicuous instance may be mentioned here. In the section dealing with the theatre and games (group I, section v) we miss the passage from Lamen-

tation rabba 3. 12, where the methods of the clown and mime are described. The ten paragraphs included in this section are of more general character than this one.

Each group is preceded by a brief introduction which draws attention to the outstanding features of the texts, and incidentally a fairly complete bibliography is given. The copious notes, which elucidate each paragraph philologically and historically, are in themselves valuable contributions to rabbinic studies. They are a store-house of learning, and solve many a difficulty in midrashic literature. The hand of a master is discernible everywhere. There are cases in which one may differ from Dr. Krauss, but he is always bold and original, and his explanations deserve the highest consideration. In one difficult passage, however, he seems to have missed the exact force of the midrashic text, although the author of the commentary *Matnot Kehunnah*, to whom Dr. Krauss does not refer in this instance, had found the right solution. No. 47 (p. 26) cites the following passage from Leviticus rabba 13. 5: (חַיָּה הָיִיתָ) וַאֲרִי חַיָּה אַחֲרֵי תְּנִינָה דְּמִיָּה לְדֹב, לְרֹב בְּתִיב, זֶה: 5. מְדִי, הוּא דַעְתָּה דְּרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן דְּאָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן עַל כֵּן הִכָּם אָרְיָה מִיַּעַר, זֶה מְדִי כְּבָל; וְאֵב עֲרֻבוֹת יִשְׁדָּרִים, זֶה מְדִי. This is translated: '[Ich schaute], und sieh, das zweite, ein anderes Tier, gleich einem Bären.—"Bär" steht [mangelhaft] geschrieben: das ist Medien. Das eben ist die Ansicht Rabbi Johanan's; denn also sprach R. Johanan: darum schlug sie der Löwe aus dem Walde (Jer. 5. 6)—das ist Babel; der Wolf der Steppe verwüstet sie—das ist Medien.' In note 2, Dr. Krauss refers to No. 41, where a similar passage is cited from Esther rabba. It is explained in note 1 of that paragraph that the defective writing of לֹב indicates the worthlessness of Media. As R. Johanan's statement was not given in full by the compiler, the inadequacy of the explanation was not apparent. But in No. 47, where the complete text is given, one fails to understand how the anonymous opinion which compares Media to a bear is identical with that of R. Johanan who says that Media is the 'wolf of the desert.' The commentary *Matnot Kehunnah* on Esther rabba (*introduction*, § 5) admirably explains that לֹב written defectively may be read as לֹב which means *wolf*

in Aramaic. The passage should accordingly be rendered: '*I saw, and behold another beast, a second, like a bear*; it is written: "a wolf," which refers to Media. This is the opinion of R. Johanan, for R. Johanan said: "*Wherefore a lion out of the forest doth smite them* refers to Babylon; *a wolf of the deserts doth spoil them* refers to Media."' This midrashic interpretation applies to both passages, Nos. 41 and 47.

Dr. Krauss has a long note on the difficult word מְנוּלִים (No. 241, excerpted from Genesis rabba 5. 1) in which he gives his own view as well as that of I. Löw, both of whom take it as a loan-word from Greek or Latin. As neither explanation is satisfactory, it occurs to me that a genuinely Semitic noun may have been preserved here, and that מְנוּל is by metathesis identical with Arabic أَنْمَلَةٌ *tip of the finger*. Accordingly, either בְּאַצְבָּעוֹ is a gloss, or מְנוּלִים refers to a different part of the finger used for making signs.

Great care was taken to edit the texts as scientifically as possible with the material available for the various books, although Dr. Krauss wisely refrained from giving variants. The vocalization, too, received the most careful attention, and while, as we shall presently see, there are some errors and misprints, this feature of the volume makes an excellent impression. In many instances 'traditional' vocalizations are disregarded, and Dr. Krauss has advanced the study of the various Aramaic dialects to a considerable extent. But it is extremely hard to break away from tradition, and even this volume, which is the work of one of our foremost philologists, still retains traditional errors. A comparison with Syriac and Arabic would prove conclusively that we should vocalize הֲרֵא not הֲרֵא (p. 7 and throughout the book). Instead of נִעְשִׂים (p. 9) read נִעְשִׂים. The technical usage of the form הֵי introducing a biblical verse, when a special signification is applied to it, is well known. Its exact force, however, has not hitherto been satisfactorily explained. The traditional pronunciation הֵי is, to my mind, due to the influence of Job 37. 6. In none of the cases does the imperative make any sense. The usual explanation is that הֵי is an elliptical expression, and that

the word **אוֹמֵר** is to be supplied. But it is very unlikely that the essential part of an expression should be dropped, while the auxiliary verb alone is retained. Moreover **הוּי אוֹמֵר** is used in a different way. Would it not be possible to vocalize it **הוּי** and consider it as an active participle? It would thus be the translation of *id est*, which is its actual signification. Dr. Krauss has **הוּי** (No. 17 and elsewhere), and correctly translates it by *also*. Instead of **מָאן** (No. 19), read **מֵאן**; cp. **לְמָן** (No. 21). **אֵן מֵן** = **מֵן** (= biblical **מֵאֵן**), and should be **מֵנִין**, not **מֵנִין** (No. 22). As no noun **הֵמִי** is known, **הֵמִיָּה** (No. 24) is impossible; read either **הֵמִיָּה**, or **הֵמוֹנִיָּה** as in the parallel passages. An unsatisfactory innovation is **קַל וְחוֹמֵר** (*ibid.* and elsewhere). Traditional **קַל וְחוֹמֵר** is incongruous, but **חוֹמֵר** is unknown in the sense required for this phrase. The best solution is to read **קַל וְחוֹמֵר**. See *Monumata Talmudica*, Recht, p. 48. Instead of **וְהַצִּירָה** (No. 27, p. 17) read **וְהַצִּירָה**, as the root is **צָרַר**. **קַעֲקָעָה** (No. 34a, p. 18) is unlikely; read **קַעֲקָעָה**. **גִּלְיִין** (No. 37 b) is no doubt a misprint for **גִּלְיִין**. Instead of **אֲדוּמָה** (No. 38, p. 21) vocalize **אֲדוּמָה**. In Aramaic **וְנִצַּח** (p. 22) is impossible; read **וְנִצַּח**. For **עֲרֵבָה** (No. 39) read **עֲרֵבָה**. As **לְמִכְנָשָׁא** (No. 40 b) is a Pael infinitive, it ought to be **לְמִכְנָשָׁא**. The vocalization **אֲחֵרָנָא** (No. 42, p. 24 and elsewhere) is indefensible; it should be **אֲחֵרִינָא**. Cp. Dan. 7. 5. For **מְתִיב** (p. 26) read **מְתִיב**. From a root **דִּין** or **דִּין** the forms **לְדִין** and **וְאֲדִין** (No. 48) are impossible; read **לְדִין** and **אֲדִין**, respectively. That the Kal is intended may be seen from **וְדִן** in the same paragraph. The vocalization **רִאָּיָה** (*ibid.*) is traditional and is not impossible, but **רִאָּיָה** is preferable and has the corroboration of Genizah fragments. Instead of **בְּעִינָא** and **מְצִית** (No. 51) read **בְּעִינָא**. The combination **חֲכָמִי הָרִאשׁוֹנִים** (p. 42) is extremely unlikely. It is to be assumed that the abbreviation sign above **חכמי** fell out, and that the copyist intended the word to be **חכמים**. Accordingly, the expression is similar to **הַסִּידִים הָרִאשׁוֹנִים**. The form **הַמְצָרִים** (No. 86) is impossible; read **הַמְצָרִים**. For **חִיבָתָא** (No. 91 b) read **חִיבָתָא**. Instead of traditional **אֵין** (No. 92 b) read **אֵין**. From biblical Aramaic we know to vocalize **בָּרַם**, whatever its etymology, not **בָּרַם** (No. 94 a and elsewhere). From the root **יָע** (see e. g.

Esther 5. 9) we cannot get the form וּמְוִיעַ (p. 53); vocalize וּמְוִיעַ. Instead of תַּמְּהָה (No. 100, p. 55) it is preferable to read תַּמְּהָה. For תַּמְּשִׁיט and תַּמְּשִׁיט (No. 108) read תַּמְּשִׁיט and תַּמְּשִׁיט, respectively. וּמְרַעְעָה (No. 115) is indefensible; read וּמְרַעְעָה. As אִיקְטִיל is an Ithpeel, it should be אִיקְטִיל, not אִיקְטִיל (No. 119 a). For נַעְבֵּד וְעָלָל (No. 124, p. 66) read נַעְבֵּד וְעָלָל. The Kal נִשְׁאָבְדְתִּי (No. 148) is unsuitable, as a transitive form is required; read נִשְׁאָבְדְתִּי. Instead of תַּמְּנִיָּה (No. 153, p. 77) vocalize תַּמְּנִיָּה. For the impossible רִאֲתָאֲמַרְתָּ (No. 157) read רִאֲתָאֲמַרְתָּ. Insert a *mappik* in the He of לְמַסְכָּה (No. 180). As the root is צָר, we should vocalize אֲצוֹר, not אֲצוֹר (No. 190). Instead of הָאוּמָנִין (No. 198) read הָאוּמָנִין or הָאֲמָנִין; see my remarks in *JQR*, N. S., VII, p. 406. For הַבִּיאֹהִי (No. 198) read הַבִּיאֹהִי, וּנְתַנְהוּ. The Kal יִטְרַד (No. 204, p. 99) does not suit the context; read יִטְרַד, and cp. No. 314 where the Nifal is correctly used. The vocalization דִּיּוּרִים (No. 241) does not seem to be satisfactory; on the analogy of נִבְּרַד and נִבְּרַד, both of which are *fa"āl* forms, we ought to read דִּיּוּרִים or דִּיּוּרִים. Syntactically שִׁיֵּצָא וְנִכְנָס would be better than שִׁיֵּצָא וְנִכְנָס (No. 244). A comparison of Hebrew בֵּית with Arabic بَيْت would prove that the correct vocalization is סִיף, not כִּיף (No. 249). The latter would signify a *swordsman*. Instead of לִבְוִיָּה (No. 272 a) read לִבְוִיָּה. For עֲבָרָה (No. 327, p. 141) read עֲבָרָה, as the *Ḳameṣ* cannot be dropped in this case, no matter whether the word stands for מַעְבָּרָה or is a form like יוֹלֵד (Judges 13. 8). Dr. Krauss is right in considering וְאִילוֹ (No. 346) as an interrogative and not as a demonstrative pronoun. But it seems to me that the demonstrative plural is אֵלֵּי, similar to biblical אֵלֶּה, while the interrogative should be אֵילֵּי, like אֵיזָה. Instead of וְנִלְחָם (No. 356) read וְנִלְחָם. The form הַסְרַחוֹן (No. 376) is without analogy; read הַסְרַחוֹן. The impersonal use of יִשְׁמְרוּ (No. 386) is rather awkward; the Nifal יִשְׁמְרוּ is preferable.

*Hebräische Rhythmik*: die Gesetze des alttestamentlichen Vers- und Strophenbaues. Kritisch dargestellt. Von EDUARD KÖNIG, Dr. Litt. Semit., Phil., Theol., ordentlichem Universitätsprofessor und Geh. Rat in Bonn. Halle: VERLAG DER BUCHHANDLUNG DES WAISENHAUSES, 1914. pp. viii + 76.

*Homeric Memory Rhyme*: A restatement of its principles, with additions on memory rhyme controlling in the most ancient Hebrew poetry. By WILLIAM VINCENT BYARS. St. Louis: THE ROSS-GOULD CO., 1916. pp. 15.

As poetry is one of the most fascinating branches of literature, every detail concerning the principles underlying it deserves attention. Writers on this subject often find it difficult to lay down hard and fast rules as to the exact definition of poetic compositions as distinct from prose. In its external features the definition is quite easy: a poetic composition has rhyme or metre, or both together. In every literature there exist numerous treatises on prosody, and this testifies to the great interest taken by scholars and writers in this subject. In classical and modern literatures the problems confronting the student are very few. The principles are rarely, if ever, a matter of dispute, and it is only in very minute details that difference of opinion is likely to exist. In Horace's *Odes*, where about seventeen different metres are to be found, one may now and then come across a difficult line, but on the whole the *Odes* are easily scanned. The same applies to Shakespeare and other poets, who have consciously employed one metre or another. It is true that there is room for investigation into the origin of the various kinds of metres, but thus far this study has hardly made any satisfactory progress. With the poetry of the Bible, however, the case is quite different. Here the principles are still to be discovered. That the Bible contains poetic compositions has been recognized from the earliest times. Even without possessing definite knowledge as to what constitutes a Hebrew poem, students have rarely found it difficult to point out the poetic compositions in the Bible.

Indeed, in many cases the biblical writers themselves designated their compositions as poems. The real difficulty arose when attempts were made to understand the rules governing these compositions. The first question that may be pertinently asked is whether the poets themselves were conscious of any rule at all. The poetic soul pours itself out in rhythmic flow without being bound by any artificial rules. The ear catches the melodious sounds without attempting to analyse them. The success of an investigation of this nature largely depends upon the correct answer to this question. It is obviously futile to attempt to discover and describe definite rules where none exists. And indeed it may be asserted that the Bible contains passages which undoubtedly follow artificial rules of prosody, while there are a good many which are mere poetic outbursts. It is the failure to grasp this fact that is responsible for a number of fanciful theories on this subject. A student stumbles over a group of verses, thinking that he has discovered a new law, and immediately proceeds to make all other poetic passages to conform to that principle. He usually finds that his theory cannot be made to apply to other books, and he blames the masoretic text or our ignorance of the real nature of the vocalic values. Some scholars are bold enough to emend the masoretic text in order to make it conform to the new theories, forgetting that by this process any passage, prose or poetry, can be shown to be based on any given metre. There is probably an element of truth in most of the books on biblical prosody that have recently been published; it is in working out the details that they have practically all failed.

Even the early mediaeval Jewish writers evinced interest in this subject. The poet and critic Moses ibn Ezra (born about 1070) in his Arabic treatise on Hebrew poetry (*Kitāb al-Muḥā-darah wal-Mudākarah*, a complete manuscript of which has been preserved at the Bodleian Library; the first four chapters were published by Kokovtsov from a Petrograd manuscript), while his aim is avowedly practical, to teach the poet his art, devotes the beginning of the fourth chapter to speculative study. He asserts that the poetic portions of the Bible, like Psalms, Proverbs, and Job,

have neither rhyme nor metre, and they must be regarded as free compositions similar to the Rajaz poems of the Arabs. It is only accidental that a rhyme occurs now and again. (הרה אלתלתה) אספאר גיר ראנעה אלי וון ולא קאפיה . . . ואנמא הי כאלראנזי עלי (חיאלהא. וקד אתפק פי בעצהא שי מן טריק אלרגו He quotes the following examples of rhyme in the Bible :

(Job 28. 16)	בְּשֵׁהֶם יָקָר וְסִפִּיר	לֹא תִסְלֶה בְּכֶתֶם אוֹפִיר
( <i>ibid.</i> 33. 17)	וְגִוָּה מְנַבֵּר יִכְסֶּה	לְהִסִּיר אָדָם מַעֲשֶׂה
( <i>ibid.</i> 21. 4)	וְאִם־מִדּוּעַ לֹא־תִקְצַר רוּחִי	הָאֲנָכִי לְאָדָם שִׁיחִי

As one of the greatest masters of the technique of mediaeval Hebrew poetry, he is more advanced than some modern scholars who try to discover rhymes in the Bible. They usually cite Exod. 15. 23, where the apparent rhyme is undoubtedly due to the unavoidable use of the pronominal suffix.

During the last few centuries the study of this subject has been taken up by Christian theologians, and various theories have been advanced from time to time. Classical scholars like Francis Gomarus (*Lyra Davidis*, 1637) and Francis Hare (*Psal-morum libri in versiculos metricè divisi*, 1636) attempted to prove that the Hebrew metre was quantitative, similar to that of Greek and Latin. In this respect they had been anticipated by Josephus, who assumed that there were trimetres, pentametres, and hexametres in the Bible. The Arabist William Jones applied the rules of Arabic prosody to the poetic books of the Bible (*Poeseos Asiaticae commentatorium*, 1774). G. Bickell, a Syriac scholar of renown, is of opinion that Hebrew metre is like that of the Syrians (*Metrices Biblicae*, 1879; *Carmina Veteris Metrici*, 1882; *Dichtungen der Hebräer*, 1882-84). In more recent years a vast literature on this subject has sprung up. Sievers, Zapletal, D. H. Müller, Zorell, H. Grimme, and others have published valuable monographs, although their theories can only be accepted with the greatest of caution. There is one fallacy common to them all: their theories involve substantial emendations, in spite of the fact that our knowledge of the metre must necessarily be derived from the

masoretic text. It is for this reason that the rules of prosody can as yet not be used as an aid to textual criticism. Only in one instance have we reliable guidance, and that is in the alphabetic acrostic. Excellent results have been obtained in Nahum 1, where parts of the original text have been restored by this method. Another interesting case is Psalm 37. 28, where the letter ע is missing, and there can be no doubt that לעולם must be emended.

As the literature on this subject is growing rapidly, it is desirable that a scholar who can speak with authority should clarify matters and summarize the present state of our knowledge. Prof. König is one of the foremost grammarians and lexicographers of our age. He has contributed to almost every branch of biblical research, and one of his greatest merits is that he has advanced very cautiously, and has discouraged ingenious, but unsubstantiated, innovations. Some years ago (1900) he published a book entitled *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik*, in which every phase of this subject was minutely and thoroughly discussed. Since that time many monographs have appeared, and in his present volume Prof. König justifies his position, proving the untenability of the theories of some recent writers. There is extremely valuable material collected here, and the criticism of the various books is clear and trenchant. He is only willing to admit that the biblical rhythm consists of accented and unaccented syllables, but refuses to recognize that there are any hard and fast rules as to the intervals when the accented syllables are to occur. It was left to the poet to put the accented syllable wherever he pleased. Prof. König puts it very pithily: the idea dominated the external form. Every branch of prosody is thoroughly discussed in this book, and the most tenable view is adopted.

There is one minor instance where Prof. König is carried away by his own ingenuity. After having pointed out that מַעֲשֵׂי in Psalm 45. 2 is identical with Greek ποίησις, he observes that Judah ha-Levi, too, employs the word מַעֲשֵׂה in that sense. In his philosophic work *al-Khazari*, chap. 2, § 78, he blames the Hebrew poets for having imitated the forms of alien poetry, and applies to them Psalm 106. 35: 'They mingled themselves with

the nations, and learned their *works*.' It is hardly necessary to refute this anachronism which credits this great mediaeval poet with the knowledge of an ingenious theory of modern scholars. Judah ha-Levi would have applied this verse to any kind of imitation.

Prof. König is desirous of making this book accessible to those students who are interested in the prosody of the Bible but are not acquainted with the Hebrew language. He has therefore transcribed the examples in Roman characters.

Of a very peculiar character is Mr. Byars's short essay on some phases of ancient Hebrew prosody. The writer purposely divested it of all 'learned' arguments, and merely states the principles as they present themselves to him, without attempting to elaborate or illustrate them. In 1895 he discovered that 'the Homeric poems are based on rhyming staves, with an over- and under-tone of rhyme, relieved by blank pauses, and developed artistically through the syntax of the Greek language' (p. 4). He has since then become convinced that similar laws apply to Hebrew poetry. This essay contains twelve paragraphs, the first ten of which deal with classical literature. He lays great stress on the use of the voice, for it is only through accurate reading and intonation that the melodious force of a poem can be caught by the ear. Few examples are given to illustrate the principles enunciated by Mr. Byars, and hence the average student will certainly miss many a point. As to Hebrew verse of the first period, it 'is certainly quantitative, certainly written to scale, certainly defined in its measures by rhymed as well as blank pauses, and certainly dependent for its melody on the same principles through which the melody of Greek and Latin verse, with art at its highest, develops from the necessary habits of the ear, as acquired in speaking an inflectional language' (p. 12). Mr. Byars tells us of his own experience that 'within two months after recovering the stave-measures of the verse of the Book of Job' he 'had in memory more of the language' than he 'had gained in two years previously. Within two days after its vowel time had been assimilated, it became a language of less difficulty than modern

German' (p. 13). In their present form Mr. Byars's views are hardly likely to attract attention. Apart from the fact that only a limited number of copies has been issued, the principles are stated in too general and vague a manner to be considered by scholars. It is true that Mr. Byars has evidently no desire to convince the 'learned' world. But the 'unlearned' world will certainly take no interest in so abstruse a subject as the mysteries of ancient Hebrew prosody. The writer owes it to himself, as well as to the advancement of science, to elaborate his theories and to work out every step in detail, in order to ascertain whether they accord with facts or not. Personal convictions must be discounted in scientific research, although they are sometimes of great value as a starting-point.

*Mischnaiot*: Hebräischer Text mit Punktation. Nebst deutscher Uebersetzung und Erklärung. Teil V—Seder Kodaschim. Von Rabb. Dr. J. COHN, Rawitsch. Berlin: H. ITZKOWSKI, 1915. pp. 257-288 (9. Heft, Bechorot, Abschn. 4-9).

It would be instructive to compare the two editions of the vocalized text of the Mishnah with German translations that are now being published, the one by a group of the ablest Jewish scholars and the other by Christian theologians. In their external make-up, the volumes that have hitherto appeared under the editorship of Georg Beer and Oscar Holtzmann are much more attractive than the others, while for accuracy of learning and sound scholarship one must turn to the edition which is being prepared by D. Hoffmann, Baneth, A. Samter, M. Petuchowski, and J. Cohn. At present the latter has a serious disadvantage: for one reason or another the publisher does not issue complete volumes at a time, but pamphlets of thirty-two pages each. Very often the pamphlet breaks off in the middle of a sentence, and the reader has to wait a long time before the continuation

appears. The present pamphlet begins with the middle of the last paragraph of Bekorot 4, and ends with the middle of 9. 8.

The text, which is based upon the ordinary editions of the Mishnah, is well edited, though variants from the different editions and manuscripts are inadequately discussed. The copious notes are mainly taken from the Gemara and all the Jewish commentators, mediaeval and modern, and the halakic part is fully explained. This commentary gives an excellent presentation of the traditional interpretation of the Mishnah, but, to my mind, Maimonides was not sufficiently drawn upon. Moreover, no attempt seems to have been made to go beyond these commentators, and the difficult names for diseases and bodily defects occurring in this tractate still remain obscure and vague as before. As characteristic of the neglect of modern philological research the following instance may be cited: In 7. 4 there occur two difficult terms, צִפִּים and צִפֵּעַ, which require elucidation. But Dr. Cohn reproduces the Hebrew words without translating them, as if they were well-known expressions in German, and in his notes he merely calls attention to the fact that the editions of the Talmud have צוּמם and צוּמֵעַ. It seems to me that צִפִּים is connected, if not identical, with Arabic أَصَمَّ *deaf* (Hebrew *fi'il* forms are *af'al* in Arabic). The Mishnah itself tells us that this defect is in connexion with the ear. צִפֵּעַ may be remotely connected with صَمِيعَ. In another case the reading of the Hebrew text does not agree with the translation. In 8. 1 we have נְנוּנִים, which can be nothing else than Arabic جنين *fetus, embryo*, while the translation has *verschiedenartigen Dingen*, which represents גוונים, a variant found in the Talmud. In the notes, however, the correct meaning of ננונים is given.

The vocalization is not quite satisfactory, and the following errors may be pointed out. הַטִּילָהוּ (5. 6) should be הַטִּילָהוּ, as the root is טיל, not נטל; cp. e.g. Jonah 1. 4. Instead of הוֹטְמוֹ (6. 4) read הַטְמוֹ, as may be seen from Aramaic הוּטְמָא. From 1 Kings 7. 23 we know to vocalize עָנול not עָנול (6. 8). Instead of מַאֲבָרָיו (7. 4) read מַאֲבָרָיו. The Yod after the Alef found in some editions and manuscripts may have merely been

reproduced from the singular. It is also possible that this Yod represents the *e* class of vowels, which includes a *shewa* whose origin was *e*. A similar purpose is served by Waw: it stands for the *o* or *u* class of vowels, including a *shewa* which was reduced from an original *o* or *u*, as, for instance, אֶזְכָּרִים. Instead of עָלָה (7. 6) vocalize עֲלָה, as it undoubtedly is a form like אֲלָה, פִּפְסָה, and others.

B. HALPER.

Dropsie College.